



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE PAN-AMERICAN CONFERENCE.

BY M. ROMERO, MEXICAN MINISTER TO THE UNITED STATES.

II.

THE United States delegates viewed the election of Mr. Blaine as an act of deference and courtesy to themselves, and decided to reciprocate it by offering their support in carrying out any plan the Latin-American delegates might accept for the appointment of one or more vice-presidents. With the best intention of pleasing their colleagues, and following the parliamentary practices which prevail in this country, the United States delegates made a suggestion, which did not find favor, to the effect that, there being three different sections of America represented in the Conference, a vice-president should be elected for each of them—to wit, one from the delegates of Central America, two from the delegates of South America (one representing the eastern side, or the nations bordering on the Atlantic, and the other the western side, or the nations bordering on the Pacific), and a fourth to represent the Latin portion of North America.

Although I do not believe that any of the delegates desired to be elected vice-president on personal grounds, the matter was looked upon with a great deal of interest by all of them, on account of the political bearing which it might have on the relations between their respective countries. The above suggestion was not accepted, owing to the difficulty of coming to an agreement about the appointment of one or more vice-presidents; and it was decided that none should be elected, but that in the absence of the president his place should be filled by each delegate in turn as designated by lot.

The question of the precedence of the nations represented in the Conference was next brought up. Some thought that the alphabetical order should be adopted, and others that this

matter also should be decided by lot. The latter plan prevailed, and in the third meeting of the Conference all the nations represented were placed in ballot, and thus the precedence given to their delegates was decided. This arrangement would very likely have lasted during the remaining sessions of the Conference had the president been a man of fewer engagements than the Secretary of State, and one who would have been able to attend all the meetings and remain as long as they lasted ; but, this not being so, it was found, soon afterwards, that the change of the presiding officer every day created many difficulties, because there was no uniformity in the decisions of the chair; and this caused delay and inconvenience in the workings of the Conference. For this reason it was agreed to elect two vice-presidents, who should be called to the chair by turns in the absence of the president, and that in their absence the chair should be filled by the other delegates in regular order. In compliance with this agreement, on December 6 a ballot was taken for first vice-president. There being no majority in favor of any of the candidates, very likely on account of the differing political tendencies of the South American states, the vote was adjourned to the following day, when it resulted in a tie, the delegate from Peru having obtained eight votes and a delegate from Mexico eight also. As Mexico had two delegates, the second intended to vote for his colleague, not as an honor to him personally, but to their country, which course would have been perfectly proper ; but he was induced by his colleague to give up this purpose, and the election was decided by lot, the Peruvian delegate drawing the first vice-presidency and a delegate from Mexico the second vice-presidency.

Then occurred an incident, insignificant in itself, but which caused a misunderstanding that I do not think is yet fully dispelled. As the United States delegates were disposed to accept and support anything that their colleagues might determine upon in regard to the vice-presidency, as an act of courtesy towards them and in exchange for their electing as president the Secretary of State, they thought that the Latin-American delegates would be more free to discuss and decide this point, which was a delicate one (being somewhat personal), if they consulted by themselves ; and for this reason the United States delegates were not present in the room where their colleagues met.

Their absence, however, was considered by some of the Latin-American delegates as an act of discourtesy, because they believed that a want of consideration had induced them not to assemble in the same room, whereas the true reason was a desire to show consideration for their associates.

Another incident which threatened to disturb the good understanding of the Conference was the view entertained by the Argentine delegation that the delegates should only express the official opinion of their governments, and that personal views ought not to be taken into consideration either in the Conference or in the committees. The law providing for the meeting of the Conference had authorized each nation to send as many delegates as it thought proper, but ordered at the same time that each country should have only one vote ; so that, whatever might have been the opinions of the delegates from any state, in casting their vote only one opinion was expressed, which was the opinion of the majority, and therefore the official opinion of their government.

It was natural to suppose and to expect that each delegate would express the opinion of his government contained in his instructions, when the case under consideration was embraced in such instructions, or an opinion as nearly as possible in accord with the wishes and interests of his country as each one might form when he had not specific instructions on any particular question. In many cases the American governments either did not give instructions to their delegates or gave them very broad ones, preferring that they should exercise their own personal judgment and discretion on such questions as might arise. To assert, therefore, that the delegates ought to express only the official opinion of their governments was to interfere in a measure with the relations of the delegates to their respective governments, and to limit their right to say what they thought proper. This opinion did not meet with favor in the body, since, while it arrived at no decision on this point, it never refused to hear any personal opinion, or dissenting opinions from two or more members of the same delegation.

The appointment of the committees was a very important matter, since a great deal of the success of the Conference depended thereon, and, with a view to avoiding any unpleasantness among the delegates on this account, they agreed to

request the president to appoint them. Mr. Blaine performed that duty without consulting, as I understand, any of the delegates, only exercising his own discretion on the subject. I do not know that the appointment of the committees gave rise to any well-grounded complaint, or caused embarrassment in the transaction of the business which they had in charge. The only embarrassment I have heard of in the committees was caused by the discordant opinions of the delegates from one country who were members of the same committees, and by the fact that the United States delegates did not have instructions from their government, and could therefore express only their own personal views. In the Committee on Monetary Union there were two United States delegates, who held opposite views in regard to the coining of silver, and this made it difficult for the other members of the committee to find out what was the view of the United States government on this subject. I understand there was a similar difficulty, although in a much smaller degree, in the Committee on Communications by Railways; but the most serious troubles arose in the Welfare or Arbitration Committee, because the United States member expressed personal views, and they were not shared by the other members. The peculiarities of the United States delegate, which consisted in his tendency to delay a decision and in trying to have his views prevail over those of the majority of the committee, although he was in every other respect a most estimable gentleman, made the workings of the committees of which he was a member far from easy; more especially so in the Welfare Committee, of which he was the chairman, and which had charge of quite difficult and complicated matters. The troubles in that committee were greater, as I understand, than in any other.

My personal knowledge of what took place in the Conference leads me to think that there was not on the part of Mr. Blaine any preconceived plan about the subjects that were to be considered, except, perhaps, that of arbitration, and that he not only had no prearranged plan, but even refused to express opinions on any subject, or even to give instructions to his delegates when called on for them. Mr. Blaine's purpose, as it appears to me, was not to curtail in any manner whatever the full freedom of all the Latin-American nations represented in the Con-

ference, and to allow equal freedom to the United States delegates, so that all might propose and agree on such points as they should think most advantageous to the interests of their respective countries, without any pressure and without even suggestions from the United States government. Even in regard to the arbitration plan Mr. Blaine's wish was only that an agreement should be arrived at to the end that all disputes arising among American nations might be ended by arbitration, with the very laudable and humanitarian object of abolishing war; and he did not seem to have any special plan of his own. When he drafted one, he did it with the purpose of uniting the discordant opinions of the delegates, and without intending to press it upon any one. His interference on this subject was only for the purpose of proposing the plan which was accepted by a majority of the Conference; and to carry out this purpose he had to instruct one of the United States delegates to give up his opposition to the form in which the project was finally accepted. It was asserted at the time that even the general idea of arbitration was not unanimously supported by the representatives of the United States.

Arbitration is a very difficult and complicated subject. It cannot be denied that during the last centuries mankind has advanced very rapidly in civilization and moral sense, and it is to be hoped that, before the lapse of a long period, such advancement will make war impossible, for war has been thus far one of the greatest scourges which have afflicted the human race. But as long as the moral sense of civilized countries will not disapprove of war as a savage way of adjusting differences among themselves, not much advancement will be made by accepting arbitration in solemn treaties, especially if no method of coercion is agreed upon against such nations as may refuse to compromise their differences, and such a method cannot be established without attempts against the sovereignty and independence of the respective states.

It was thought by some that the purpose of the United States was to establish a permanent court of arbitration at Washington, and this was looked upon as a way of giving the United States a decided preponderance in all questions affecting this continent. Although I understand that the United States delegate who was chairman of the Committee on Welfare looked favorably upon the idea of having a permanent tribunal, and his views on this

subject were shared by one of his colleagues, the plan was not accepted by the other Latin-American delegates, nor by the Secretary of State of the United States, and had, therefore, to be abandoned.

Mr. Blaine wished arbitration without limitations, which might nullify the principle. Chili did not favor arbitration, except in a very restricted manner. Mexico and the Argentine Republic desired reasonable limitations, while all the other states accepted the idea without any. The Argentine and Brazilian delegates introduced, on January 15, an arbitration project which contained, besides, declarations and stipulations against conquest. This was referred on that date to the Committee on Welfare, and was not reported by that committee until April 10, near the close of the sessions of the Conference, which adjourned on the 19th.

While this project was in committee Mr. Blaine had two meetings with delegates at his residence; the first one with the representatives of Chili, the Argentine Republic, Brazil, and Mexico, whose views were supposed not to be in entire accordance with Mr. Blaine's, although the republican government of Brazil had then authorized its delegates to accept the widest possible plan of arbitration; and the second meeting with all the other delegates, who fully accepted the views of the Secretary of State.

On account of the objections made to the Argentine project, both by Mr. Blaine and by some Spanish-American delegates, the committee, of which the Argentine delegate was the leading spirit, gave the matter the form in which it was finally reported, and it was divided into two parts, one containing all the stipulations in regard to arbitration proper and the other embracing all those relating to conquest.

The report of the committee was presented to the Conference so late that it could only be taken up partially in three meetings, and there was not sufficient time to consider it carefully, or even to adopt verbal amendments which were necessary to make it more clear and precise. It can, therefore, be properly said that there was no discussion on the subject, since such views as were expressed by the delegates were only given for the purpose of explaining their votes and the position of their respective governments. The United States delegate who was a member of the committee did not accept the second part of the original project against conquest. This

refusal came near causing a failure of arbitration, and to avoid such failure Mr. Blaine had to accept that project.

He desired that the delegates who had accepted the report of the committee should sign it in the shape of a treaty before the Conference closed its sessions. His grounds therefore were that Article I. of the act convening the Conference mentioned as its principal object the consideration and recommendation for adoption of a plan of arbitration. Several delegates, among them the Argentines, were of the opinion that this matter ought not to be treated in a different way from the others, and were willing to sign the recommendation relative to arbitration, provided all the other recommendations adopted by the Conference were signed in the same manner. As there was no time to engross all of them, the formality of signature was, on motion of a delegate from the United States, limited to that concerning arbitration, and this prevented the Argentine delegates from signing it. On that occasion Mr. Blaine's earnestness carried him so far that he thought it necessary to come down from the chair and take the place of a delegate in supporting the motion, which was finally carried. The delegates from Colombia, Venezuela, Peru, and Paraguay did not sign the agreement, although they had voted for it. The delegate from Costa Rica left Washington before the paper was signed. After the close of the Conference a formal treaty was signed by the same delegates who had signed the recommendation, the Venezuelan government having subsequently given its adhesion thereto, as I understand.

It is not unlikely that the division of the Argentine project into two parts, one of which has already been signed as a treaty and the other accepted only as a mere recommendation, may prevent its ratification by the Argentine government.

Although Mr. Blaine was the leading spirit of the arbitration project, he cannot be considered as the author of the form in which it was finally approved by the Conference, because he had to give up much for the purpose of securing the acceptance of the principle of arbitration ; but he wrote the preamble to that paper.

The population, territorial extension, trade, wealth, and advanced civilization of the United States make them the greatest and most important nation on this continent, and on this account they had decided advantages over some of the smaller

nations, which they could easily bring to bear in case of difficulties with them. The plan approved by the Conference deprives them of all these advantages, and places them in the same position as the weakest American nation. It is true that this agreement, equitable as it is in all its bearings, as all the countries participate in it under the most absolute equality, might be made to serve hereafter in establishing the preponderance of the United States ; but should they intend to undertake this, they would not bind themselves with an agreement which they would have to break more or less openly before they could take other steps. This appears so clear to my mind that I think it will be difficult to secure the ratification of this agreement by the Senate of the United States.

The Mexican government did not look with good-will, for obvious reasons, at the idea of forced and unrestricted arbitration ; and as Article XXI. of the treaty of February 2, 1848, provides ample arbitration with this country, Mexico thought it prudent not to have it extended any further, and instructed its delegates accordingly. We therefore did not intend to take any part in the discussion of this subject, but only to cast our votes in accordance with our instructions when the question was put. But when the Mexican government heard that several South American nations were disposed to go much further than Mexico in the premises, not wishing to appear in disaccord with its sister-republics, it authorized its delegates to extend the scope of arbitration, but not to accept it without limitation.

I had, however, to give up the purpose of taking a passive position on this question, because the Secretary of State requested me in a special manner to prepare a draft of arbitration which, in my opinion, might be acceptable to the Mexican government and the Latin-American states which were not disposed to accept it without limitation. I stated to him, with all candor and sincerity, the obstacles which were in my way in drafting a project which I was not sure would have the support even of my own government ; but, in order not to disregard his repeated requests, and because I thought that I might possibly draft something which would be acceptable to all, I consented to take up the matter and to speak on the subject with several of my colleagues. Soon afterwards, however, I found that the difficulties in the way of coming to an agreement

were insurmountable, and I wholly gave up the attempt. When the report of the committee was discussed in the Conference, the Mexican delegation only expressed the opinion of their government, and voted in accordance with their instructions when they had specific instructions, or with what they understood to be the wishes of their government on new points about which there had been no time to receive instructions.

There were other subjects connected with arbitration which were looked upon in a very different way by Mexico and the South American nations. I refer to the boundary question, and, in fact, to all territorial questions. In the immense territorial area, very thinly populated, of the South American nations, its people being of a homogeneous race and having the same religion, habits, and language, and those nations not having, as a general rule, clearly-marked territorial limits, the boundary questions which have sprung up among themselves are relatively of little importance. A portion of land practically uninhabited does not diminish in any perceptible manner the domain of the nation that may lose it, nor increase in a large way the power of the nation which may acquire it, nor make any change of race in the inhabitants. This is not the case as between Mexico and the United States, because they are countries inhabited by different races, speaking different languages, having different customs, religions, and habits, and because the proportion of population, wealth, and material strength between them constitutes a very different condition of things. The boundary disputes in South America have generally been decided, and with a great deal of reason too, by arbitration, and in the minds of its statesmen it is the belief that, if arbitration is good for anything, it is precisely to end such disputes. Perhaps it is the best way to solve them in any case; but to make arbitration obligatory as to all questions, including the boundary difficulties, which may arise between Mexico and the United States, would be equivalent to placing Mexico in an unfavorable position. Therefore such a broad stipulation, which is not only desirable, but even necessary, in South America, could not be accepted by Mexico. This explains why Mexico could not follow her sister-republics in all the details of this subject.

Reciprocity treaties have a great rôle to perform in the development of commercial relations between the Spanish American

nations and the United States, but, unfortunately, public opinion is not yet prepared in this country to accept them. The subject of reciprocity is far more complicated than it appears to be, since it is connected with the protection and free-trade questions which are now so earnestly agitated in this country. The United States, as an eminently Anglo-Saxon nation, have always followed, although sometimes with slowness, the footsteps of the mother-country, in many cases even surpassing her; and, although thus far they do not seem disposed to accept free trade, which has done so much to secure the commercial preponderance of England, I have no doubt that before long they will not remain behind Great Britain in this regard; but as the ultra-protective policy prevails here at present, it is not possible to accept reciprocity. The United States is yet an agricultural country; it is beginning to be a manufacturing one, and in this stage is making very rapid strides. When the production of manufactured articles shall exceed the needs of the home market, the protective system will have no reason to stand; production will then be cheapened; new foreign markets will be sought for the surplus products; but until then this country will be a mercantile nation. Reciprocity treaties will represent the transition between these two stages, and, therefore, for the present they are premature.

The fate of the reciprocity treaty signed with Mexico in 1883 demonstrates the correctness of this view. That treaty, which was initiated by this government, was made with a country contiguous with it for nearly two thousand miles, and which is inhabited by twelve millions of people, who produce, in proportion to their population, very few manufactured articles, but who have all the elements of soil, climate, and labor necessary to produce the raw materials needed by the manufacturing industries of the United States. That nation, too, is connected with the United States by four trunk railways built by North American companies, which are really extensions and feeders of the trunk lines of this country. It is clear that, if reciprocity could not be established with Mexico, much less can it be adopted with the other American nations, which do not have such favorable conditions, excepting perhaps Brazil, which has developed a very large trade with the United States. It has been found impossible to carry out the reciprocity treaty with Mexico, which intended,

by the exemption of duty on Mexican sugar, to open new sources of production and trade. Moreover, on account of regulations issued by the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, this country has nearly closed its doors to the chief article of Mexican export, mineral ore—an industry which has been developed by the construction of railroads in Mexico, this ore being the principal article that they transport, and which has been encouraged and increased by the capital and skill of this country.

The main reason why the reciprocity treaty with Mexico has not been put in operation has been the opposition to receiving, free of duty, Mexican sugar, notwithstanding that, as compensation for such advantage, Mexico made valuable concessions to this country; and yet in the Tariff Bill recently approved by the House of Representatives, and favorably reported by the Finance Committee of the Senate (known as the McKinley Bill), foreign sugar is exempted from all import duties, without any compensation or advantage in favor of the national production of other articles. That bill, if it ever becomes a law, will strike a terrible blow not only at reciprocity treaties, but at the increase of the trade of the United States with the other nations of this continent.

This matter was, undoubtedly, the one that was considered most fully in the Conference, and the one which commanded the most earnest attention. The committee agreed as to the difficulty of establishing a customs union, in the sense of a Zollverein, and as to the desirability of making reciprocity treaties to promote trade between the respective countries. On this point, however, the committee was divided, as the Brazilian, Colombian, Venezuelan, Nicaraguan, and Mexican members of it recommended the negotiation of such treaties, not upon a uniform basis, but in accordance with the circumstances and needs of each country, while the Argentine and Chilean delegates thought it officiousness on the part of the Conference to make any such recommendation. The Argentine government favors reciprocity treaties, since in 1875 it proposed to the United States the negotiation of one, and, as the Argentine delegate who was a member of the committee stated in the discussion, the same suggestion was renewed by the Argentine delegation to the chairman of the United States delegation in the Conference. This gentleman, who was a member of the committee, also favored reciprocity, but he did not ac-

cept without limitation the report agreed upon by the majority of his colleagues.

The essential difference between the views of the majority and the minority of the committee was that the majority thought they ought not to discourage the negotiation of reciprocity treaties, even if this was only for the purpose of leaving on the United States the responsibility of their failure, while the minority preferred to appear as discouraging them, although really they seemed convinced of the advantages of such treaties and wished to negotiate them.

The discussion on this subject was carried on mainly between the delegates of the Argentine Republic and the United States who were members of the committee ; but it properly related to the economic policy of both countries rather than to the convenience of negotiating reciprocity treaties. The Conference finally approved the recommendation of the majority in favor of such treaties, and refused to give a vote against customs union, because it thought this was a slight to the law convening the Conference, and because the United States delegates were among the first to acknowledge the impracticability of such a union. The minority had to reconsider the abrupt manner in which they rejected the customs union.

Mr. Blaine attached a great deal of importance to this matter, and the decided interest which he took in it was only revealed several months after the adjournment of the Conference. Conscious of the many advantages which will accrue to his country by the negotiation of such treaties, he did all that was in his power before the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, which was at the time preparing a tariff bill, for the purpose of inducing it to accept such a basis as would favor the negotiation of these treaties. The official and private utterances of Mr. Blaine which have since appeared show very plainly the great importance he attached to the subject, and the interest he felt in it was so great that he even went so far as to antagonize his own political party. For the failure of reciprocity treaties he, therefore, cannot be responsible. The Argentine delegates, who were not aware of all his efforts, very likely thought that he was indifferent to their proposal, but subsequent events have shown that this was not the case.

The result proves very clearly how little the real condition of things was appreciated by some of the manufacturing nations of

Europe when they feared that the United States would negotiate reciprocity treaties with the American republics that might interfere with their own present commercial relations.

Another of the principal questions submitted to the Conference was the monetary union. In this question the Conference took a step backward. The law of Congress which convened it submitted to the Conference the consideration of the convenience of "coining a silver coin of the same weight and fineness, which would be a legal-tender in all the American nations." The Conference decided to recommend the meeting in Washington of another special conference with a view to decide about the coining of *one or more coins*, without stating the metal of which they should be coined, of the same weight and fineness, to be used in the nations represented in the Conference, without stating whether they should be a legal-tender in all of them. All, or almost all, the Latin-American nations preferred the basis laid down in the convening law, but they had to yield on this point so as to act in accordance with the United States, whose delegates, excepting one, Mr. Estee, were decidedly opposed to the coining of legal-tender silver money. The law recently approved by the Congress of the United States regarding the coinage of silver very likely will influence the policy of this administration when this matter is again brought up.

The part which the Montevidean treaties took in the Conference ought not to be omitted. It is known that the principal nations of South America met in congress in Montevideo in 1888, and accepted common rules upon private, international, penal procedure, patents, trade-marks, copyright, extradition, etc., etc. The broadness and details of these rules have prevented some of the nations which attended that congress, and whose plenipotentiaries signed the treaties, from accepting them all. The Mexican government, which, at the request of the Argentine Republic, has been studying those treaties for more than a year, has not as yet come to any conclusion about them. As the rules accepted in these treaties are those prevailing in the nations which follow the Roman law, and as the United States are ruled by the English or common law, it was very difficult for this country to accept the treaties in all their details, since that would be equivalent to changing the basis of their legislation. This explains the opposition of the United States delegation to these treaties. Notwith-

standing all this, three of them—those relating to copyrights, trade-marks, and patents—were accepted by the United States delegate who was a member of the committee, and, finally, by the delegation when the matter was brought to a vote before the Conference.

The Conference took up, besides, several other subjects which, although important in themselves, appear in a secondary light when compared with those I have mentioned. I refer to the recommendation favoring a uniform system of weights and measures; those in favor of the Montevidean treaties on trade-marks, copyrights, and patents; and those to adopt uniform and liberal rules for the valuation of merchandise at the custom-houses; to simplify the import and consular dues; to establish in Washington an international bureau of information on commercial subjects; to accept any of the South American conventions for sanitary purposes; to establish railways and lines of steamers among the several nations; to negotiate extradition treaties; to establish an international bank for the purpose of carrying on the exchanges now made through London; and to study, with a view to their adoption, all the other Montevidean treaties. These matters are generally known, as they were published when adopted, and I therefore deem it unnecessary to say a word more about them.

The first result of the Conference—and I mention it in the first place because all the others depend on the ratification of the respective governments, which may or may not be accorded, while this is an effective one and will exercise great influence for some time to come—was the mutual acquaintance through their representatives of the different nations, which, being great distances apart and without any communication among themselves, were almost unknown to each other. The daily intercourse of the delegates for nearly six months, discussing important questions which affect the paramount interests of their respective countries, was to many of them a revelation of the importance and the condition of the states represented in the Conference. There is, therefore, no exaggeration in considering as its first result the sentiment of mutual respect and consideration which each delegate acquired for his colleagues and for the nations represented by them; and so far as the United States are concerned, this result was obtained not only among its delegates, but among

the governments and the people who had the opportunity of being daily informed of the doings of the Conference.

The second place belongs to the agreement on arbitration, which will be, if ratified by the various nations, a transcendent and very important measure. This by itself would be enough to make the Conference highly memorable and fruitful.

In regard to the monetary convention the Conference took a step backward, if bimetallism is a desideratum.

The other results of the Conference, although important in themselves, are far inferior to those that I have already mentioned.

At first sight it might appear that the results of the Conference have been disappointing; but I think it can be safely said that its success has been greater than there was any reason to expect. Almost all of the Latin-American nations came to Washington with a fear that the United States intended to impose upon them its material superiority, and they went back satisfied that, far from being so, this country had only sentiments of respect and consideration for its sister-republics, and that the United States simply intended to accomplish what was of mutual advantage to all, itself acting on the same footing as the smallest of the nations represented.

On the other hand, I believe that the Latin-American republics have left on the government and the people of the United States a more lasting and favorable impression than they had before been able to make. That was almost equivalent to a revelation for these people, as it gave an opportunity to form a better idea of their civilization, the material progress of their respective countries, and the worth and patriotism of their sons; and it has been, too, better understood that uniformity of practices and good understanding are almost a necessity among all the American nations. Remembering that great results in behalf of mankind cannot be reached in one day, and much less when success depends on several countries affected by different influences and conditions, I have no doubt that the meeting in Washington of an assembly in which all the American nations were represented has been as greatly advantageous to the government and the people which promoted it and carried it into effect as to the other governments which sent their delegates.

M. ROMERO.